DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 128 EC 303 950

AUTHOR Lipsky, Dorothy Kerzner; Gartner, Alan
TITLE Inclusive Education and School Restructuring.
PUB DATE Dec 94
NOTE 36p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; *Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Educational Practices; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inclusive Schools; Outcomes of Education; School Effectiveness; *School Restructuring; Special Education; Student Placement

ABSTRACT

Perspectives on educating persons with disabilities and the move toward inclusive education and school restructuring are considered. Trends in the number of students with disabilities and placement patterns are briefly examined. Four categories of students that represent 95 percent of students served are identified: specific learning disabilities, speech or language impairments, mental retardation, and serious emotional disturbances. Information is provided on differing state practices in placing students with specific disabilities in regular classes, placement of minority students in special education programs, and dropout patterns among students with disabilities. Possible reasons for the limited benefits of the current special education design are considered, with attention to inadequacies in educational practice, prejudice and discrimination, and conceptual limitations. Factors that can lead to educational improvement are discussed, including concern for the limited outcomes for students, the broader educational reform movement, recent court cases supporting inclusion, the costs of special education, and increased parental advocacy and involvement in school reform. (Contains 48 references.) (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 383 128

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AND SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING

Dorothy Kerzner Lipsky

Ph.D.

Director

National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion

The Graduate School and University Center

The City University of New York

&

Alan Gartner

Ph.D.

Dean for Research and University Programs

The Graduate School and University Center

The City University of New York

33 West 42nd Street

New York, NY 10036

(212) 642-2151

(212) 642-1972

December 1994

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. K. Lipsky

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 303 950

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AND SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING

> Outcomes of youth with disabilities exiting public schools have not improved significantly during the last decade. Both historical and current data indicate that this population of individuals continues to drop out of school at a rate ranging from 30-80% and to experience low levels of full-time employment. (Kohler, 1993, p. 107)

EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Increasingly, policy advocates have come to recognize that what is essential to change public education rather than "fixing" the current dual system of general and special education is broad educational restructuring. The future work in educational reform remains extensive; yet it is hopeful of creating a better society for all. If the handicap is a function of a disabling environment (physical or attitudinal), and if disability is a social construct, then the changes must come in both the physical environment and in the social relationships. Both of these are an integral part of the work of remaking our American society. As Barton and Landman (1993) point out, this raises even more fundamental matters: "The issue of integration is an important one. It provides an opportunity for raising serious questions about the kind of society we desire and the nature and functions of schooling" (P. 41).

Skrtic (1991) describes the nature of post-industrial society, with its emphasis on collaboration, mutual adjustment, developing a community of interests among the organizations' members, consumers, and host community. Educational equity,

Skrtic asserts,

> is a precondition for excellence in the post-industrial era, for collaboration means learning collaboratively with and from persons with varying interests, abilities, skills, and cultural perspectives, and taking responsibility for learning means taking responsibility for one's own learning and that of others. Ability grouping and tracking have no place in such a system... . (P. 181)

The issues go beyond preparation for work of the future. They go to the nature of the society -- of who is to be included and who not. In the course of American history, participation in the polity has been limited by race, gender, religion, class, and intellectual capability. In the public schools, historically, educational enrollment has been limited by race, gender, religion, class, and physical and intellectual capacity.

In both the polity and the education system, these formal exclusions have been progressively removed. For the most part, all adult Americans are eligible to vote and all children can be enrolled in the public schools. What has not been settled in either system -- the polity and the schools -- is the nature, implications, and consequence of that participation, both for the individuals and the institutions.

In terms of students with disabilities, the critical future challenge will be how we view and treat difference -- as abnormality or as an aspect of the human condition. Hahn (1994)

points out that as with other disadvantaged groups people with disabilities are striving to translate previously devalued personal characteristics into a positive sense of self-identity. He says, "a consciousness that disability simply signifies another human difference instead of functional restrictions might form the basis...to promote an increased appreciation of diversity and heterogeneity in everyday life" (P. 18).

THE CURRENT STATE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

Since the passage of P.L. 94-142 in 1975, there have been two major developments in terms of numbers and placement of students:

- first, an increase in the number of students served -- more than 1.3 million more students. This is an extraordinary achievement in terms of **access**; and
- second, despite this substantial change in numbers, and the greatest increase has been among those labelled as "Learning Disabled", the placement pattern has remained nearly identical -- about a third of the students served in regular classes, a third in Resource Rooms, and a third in special classes and more restrictive settings.

Student population

The most recent federal report, for the 1992-93 school year, reports 5,170,242 students served per IDEA, Part B, and Chapter 1. (Sixteenth Annual Report, 1994, Table 1.1) After limited year-to-year percentage increases across most of the 1980s, the

percentage increase from 1990-91 to 1991-92 was 3.7 percent, followed by another 3.7 percent increase from 1991-92 to 1992-93; these were the largest two year increases in the law's history.

Four categories continue to encompass nearly ninety-five percent of all students served: specific learning disabilities, speech or language impairments, mental retardation, and serious emotional disturbance.

Placement patterns

Placement issues involve the pattern of placement of students, as well as variability among categories and across the states. The 1992-93 school year marked the first time the proportion of students with disabilities who attended mostly regular classes outpaced those in resource rooms, separate clases or more restrictive settings. Slightly more than a third of the students were served in "regular classes" (35.7 %), a third (34.4%) in resource rooms, and somewhat fewer than a third (29.9%) in separate classes and other more restrictive placements (Sixteenth Annual Report, 1994, Figure 1.3).

Within these overall figures, there were wide ranges in placement patterns based upon student age, disability condition, and differing state practices. Most striking are between category ranges among the states. For example, for students with specific learning disabilities, the range among the states of those placed in regular classes was from 2.37% in California to 93.59% in Vermont. For students with speech or language

impairments, the range among the states of those placed in regular classes was from 4.25% in West Virginia to 99.87% in Indiana. For students with mental retardation, the range among the states of those placed in regular classes was from 0.30% in Iowa to 65.95% in Vermont. For students with serious emotional disturbance, the range among the states of those placed in regular classes was from 0.90% in Arizona to 69.90% in Vermont (Fifteenth Annual Report, 1993, Table AB2). These variations exist despite a single federal law that defines the categories and imposes on all the states a common requirement for placement of students in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

The biased views and low expectations for students in special education are reflected not just in their separation from general education classes and students but from broader educational efforts: Program innovations, designed to improve education for all students, for the most part leave out students with disabilities. For example, a recent U.S. Department of Education study of magnet schools found that students with disabilities are underrepresented in such programs (Educational innovation, 1994). Comparing their percentage in the district as a whole, approximately a third fewer special education students are enrolled in magnet programs, according to the study conducted by the American Institutes on Research.

Racial and language minorities and gender bias

Race, language and gender biases interact in special

education. Nationwide, blacks are twice as likely as whites to be in special education programs. "In 39 states, according to a U.S. News [& World Report] analysis of Department of Education data, black students are overrepresented in special education programs, compared with their percentage of the overall student population" ("Separate and unequal", 1993, p. 48). Wide disparities occur when one examines nationally the percentage of racial groups by disability category:

- Retarded: Black, 26%, white 11%, Hispanic 18%
- Learning-disabled: Black, 43%, white 51%, Hispanic 55%
- Emotionally disturbed: Black, 8%, white 8%, Hispanic 4%
- Speech-impaired: Black, 23%, white, 30%; Hispanic, 23%

("Separate and unequal", 1993, p. 54).

In reviewing data concerning states' labelling practices for black students with retardation, wide discrepancies can be identified. For example, five states label more than a third of their black special education students as retarded: Alabama, 47%; Ohio, 41%; Arkansas, 37%; Indiana, 37%, and Georgia, 36%. On the other hand, five states label fewer than a tenth of their black special education students as retarded: Nevada, 9%; Connecticut, 7%; Maryland, 8%; New Jersey, 6%; and Alaska, 3% ("Separate and unequal", 1993, 55).

The disparities in national data reflect the reality in local districts. Indeed, the disparities are magnified as minority special education students are overrepresented in just

those categories where students are placed in more restrictive settings, producing -- in effect -- double segregation. In the New York City Public Schools, for example, 84 percent of students in separate special education classes were black and Hispanic, while 73 percent of the overall student population was comprised of these two groups. On the other hand, white students, who comprised 20 percent of the school system's population accounted for 37 percent of the special education students placed in general education settings while receiving support services (Richardson, 1993, p. B7).

While issues of gender have not been extensively addressed in studies of special education referral and placement, there are some data which suggest an overreferral and certification of males (Haigh & Malever, 1993-94; Weinstein, 1993-94). At the same time, the National Longitudinal Transition Study of Special Education Students (NLTS) reports that:

> females in secondary special education represented a different combination of abilities and disabilities than males. As a group, females were more seriously impaired; even among males and females with the same disability category, females had marginally greater functional deficits than males. (Wagner, 1992, pp. 33,f.)

Outcomes

Nationally, some one quarter of the students with disabilities who exited school in the 1990-91 school year dropped

out. In addition to the 23.3% reported as having dropped out, it is likely that a significant portion of the 15.8% for whom the exiting basis is reported as "Status unknown" are likely to have dropped out (Fifteenth Annual Report, 1993, Figure 1.5).

According to the National Longitudinal Transition Study of Special Education Students, "During secondary school, poorer school performance was noted for students with disabilities that were male, African American, or from low-income or single-parent households" (The transition experiences, 1993, p. 1-4).

Comparisons with the general education student population are confounded by differences in the outcome categories used by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and those used generally. Based on a pilot study, "29 percent of all students in the NCES pilot test will drop out over the course of their high school careers, [while] the percentage of students with disabilities who will drop out, based on the same definition of a dropout, will be 38 percent" (Fifteenth Annual Report, 1993, p. 35).

Fewer than half of the students with disabilities (45.7%) exited the educational system with a regular diploma. An additional 13.3% exited with a certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, modified diploma, or completion of an IEP. The range among disability conditions varied greatly. For the four largest categories of students, the percentages of those who graduated with a regular diploma were: specific learning disabilities, 51.7%; speech or language impairments, 41.3%;

mental retardation, 38.7%; and serious emotional disturbance, 30.8% (Fifteenth Annual Report, 1993, Table 1.9).

As with their school performance, demographic factors influenced postschool outcomes. Recent research has provided striking evidence of how schools shortchange girls. Although that research concerned the general population of girls, NLTS data demonstrate similar experiences for girls with disabilities. This "shortchanging" of girls in their school experiences has consequence for postschool outcomes (Wagner, 1992).

The rate of unemployment for persons with disabilities is the highest among any population sub-group. Two-thirds of persons with disabilities are not working, while 20% work full-time and 13% work part-time. Eight out of ten who do not work say they would like to work; this is up from two of three in 1986 (Persons with disabilities, 1994).

Looked at comprehensively, young people with disabilities are not doing as well as their counterparts in the general population along a number of axes. According to the National Longitudinal Transition Study of Special Education Students, a comparison of 15- through 20-year-old youth with disabilities with youth in the general population who were in secondary school or who had been out of school for less than 2 years indicates that:

- more exiters with disabilities left secondary school by dropping out;
- fewer dropouts with disabilities completed GEDs;

- fewer graduates with disabilities attended postsecondary schools, although about the same percentage attended postsecondary vocational schools;
- fewer youth with disabilities had paid jobs, both during and after secondary school;
- more employed youth with disabilities worked part-time and in low-status jobs;
- fewer out-of-school youth with disabilities achieved residential independence; and
- more youth with disabilities were arrested. (How well are, 1992, p. 47)

These failures are not ones of the school system alone. We live in a society where there continue to be barriers for persons with disabilities, both physical and attitudinal. While the Americans with Disabilities Act is a major step forward, there is yet much to be done to assure that the United States is a country of openness and opportunity for persons with disabilities.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF LIMITED BENEFITS

Several reasons may account for the limited benefits of the current special education design for its students. Possible reasons include: inadequacies in practice, prejudice and discrimination, and conceptual limitations.

Inadequacies in educational practice

It is difficult to measure the adequacy of educational practice. P.L. 94-142 requires that states develop personnel

preparation programs which require "state-of-the-art" practices (Gilhool, 1989); however, there are no reliable overall data as to the useage of "best practices" in special education across the country. For example, Williams et al. (1990) report that while Vermont teachers express a high level of acceptance of "best practices", there was a marked gap between that level of acceptance and the level of implementation. While there have been improvements in special education practice -- both in their design[1] and their implementation -- there is a substantial inadequacy in educational practices in the current system, which accounts for the failures in student outcomes.

Prejudice and discrimination

Toward the broad sorting function which characterizes schools, special education plays a role, both for those consigned to it and for those students who remain in general education.

> Children of Special Education are children of Small Expectations, not great ones. Little is expected and little is demanded. Gradually, these children -- no matter their IQ level -- learn to be cozy in the category of being 'special.' They learn to be less than they are. (Granger &

---

[1] Pertinent here, for example, is a reconceptualization of dyslexia. A report from the Center on Molecular and Neuroscience, Rutgers University, in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, suggests that dyslexia is at root not a visual or ordinary hearing problem, but a flaw in a specific brain circuit that handles rapidly flowing auditory information (Blakeslee, 1994). If this is correct, the design of pedagogical programs to teach reading to students correctly identified as dyslexic would require a major shift.

Granger, 1988, p. 26)

> Every time a child is called mentally defective and sent off to special education for some trivial defect, the children who are left in the regular classroom receive a message: No one is above suspicion; everyone is being watched by the authorities; nonconformity is dangerous. (Granger & Granger, 1988, p. xii)

The mother of a nondisabled kindergarden student provides another perspective ("Beyond normal", 1993). At a conference with her son's teacher, the mother was told that two students with physical disabilities would be in his class. The teacher "quickly added that there would be a full-time paraprofessional so their presence would not take away time from other students. This statement was made with the best of intentions -- for my son" (P. 4). When the mother picked up her son at the end of the first day, he pointed to an adult, and said, "That lady is for the wheelchair people".

> Today I thought, 'What was Charlie going to learn about people with physical disabilities and other differences that carry the perception of not normal?' He could learn that people with disabilities are not competent and need another person to be with them, that they cannot communicate for themselves, that they remain together as a subculture within a larger community, that they are always the recipients of help from caregivers. (P. 4)

***

> The presence of children with physical disabilities in my son's class represents just one of many kinds of diversity in today's classrooms and schools. Physical proximity is the start of what could be invaluable and positive learning about and appreciating differences. I believe that children with disabilities do not take away from other children. They do not diminish the community. I believe, instead, that these two children, currently known as the 'wheelchair people', have the potential to contribute enormously to my son's learning and growth -- but only if the environment and people take advantage of this opportunity. (P. 5)

The consequences in educational practice of such factors is documented by Podell and Soodak (1993).

> [W]hen a child with mild learning problems is from a low-SES family, teachers with low personal efficacy are less likely than teachers with high personal efficacy to consider regular education to be an appropriate placement for the child. Personal efficacy did not, however, influence placement judgments about high-SES children. Thus, low-SES students may be at greatest risk for referral because of teacher, rather than student, factors. In other words, teachers' decisions about poor children are susceptible to bias when teachers perceive themselves as ineffectual. That finding may be important in understanding the

overrepresentation of low-SES children in special education (p. 251).

Current student assessment practice performs a pernicious function, and its premises implicate racial and ethnic discrimination; using IQ tests for special education certification is based upon an erroneous understanding of intelligence, as a fixed and largely heritable characteristic, that could be precisely measured and provide an accurate predictor as to future school -- and life -- course.

Conceptual limitations

Skrtic (1991) presents a far-ranging and incisive critique of the current design and conceptualization of special education. Of the critics of the present system, he says, "their criticism stops at the level of special education practices...[without] questioning the assumptions in which these practices are grounded" (P. 150). These presuppositions, he summarizes as follows:

- disabilities are pathological conditions that students have;
- differential diagnosis is objective and useful;
- special education is a rationally conceived and coordinated system of services that benefits diagnosed students; and
- progress results from rational technological improvements in diagnostic and instructional practices (P. 152).

The current design of special education is one of programs largely separate from, sometimes parallel to, and occasionally intersecting with the mainstream of education. Presently, it is the inappropriate product of an earlier period, when students with disabilities were excluded from public education. P.L. 94-142, "The Education of All Handicapped Children Act", enacted in 1975 was designed to rectify that policy of exclusion. At the same time, it sought to provide both uniformity of response in the midst of a growing number of court decisions which held that such exclusion was unconstitutional and due process rights to parents of children with disabilities, who had been largely ignored in the education of their children. (See esp. Walker, 1987.)

In many ways, P.L. 94-142 has been an extraordinary success. It (and its successor, the "Individuals with Disabilities Education Act") has assured that with few exceptions all eligible students with disabilities are provided with access to publicly supported education. While well-meaning and an advance over prior practices, the law's concept of Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) is inherently flawed. As Taylor (1988) has pointed out, the LRE principle:

- legitimates restrictive environments. While it incorporates a presumption favoring less restriction, it also implies the acceptability of a more restricted and segregated setting for at least some students;
- confuses segregation and integration on the one hand with

the intensity of services on the other. The clear implication is that students who need more intensive services must receive them in more restrictive settings. As Brown et al. (1983) noted more than a decade ago, "Any developmentally meaningful skill, attitude, or experience that can be developed or offered in a segregated school can also be developed or offered in a chronologically age appropriate regular school" (p. 17);

- is based on a "readiness" model. That is students must prove their readiness for an integrated setting, rather than presuming such a setting as the norm. Not only is this morally unacceptable, the evidence is that more restrictive settings do not prepare people for less restrictive ones; and
- directs attention to the physical settings rather than to the services and supports people need to be integrated into the community.

The law's assurance to all eligible students of a "Free Appropriate Public Education" (FAPE) suggests a pathway for educational improvement.

FORCES FOR EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT

At the present time, there are at least six factors which conduce toward educational improvement for all students. These include:

1. the growing concern as to the limited outcomes for all

students, particularly those in special education;

2. the broader education reform movement, which calls attention to higher standards for all students;

3. the recent court cases which have supported inclusion;

4. the increasing insistence of the disability rights movement for full participation, as well as the effects of attention to the Americans with Disabilities Act and its implementation;

5. the costs of special education; and

6. increased parental advocacy and involvement in school reform efforts.

1. Limited outcomes

The outcomes in education for general and special education students have been limited. This is especially significant in special education where whatever the metric used -- student learning, drop-out rates, graduation rates, post-secondary training and education, subsequent employment, or community living -- the current design as a whole has failed these students. These failures come at a cost -- in students' lives and the nation's resources. And, these costs increasingly are less acceptable, among students, their parents, and taxpayers alike.

2. Broader educational reform movement

To a large extent, the national attention to educational reform has ignored students with disabilities. In its report to

the President and the Congress, the National Council on Disability (1994) stated, "A review of eight major federal initiatives [put forward between 1990 and 1992] involving school-age children and youth shows that six did not include specific provisions for students with disabilities" (P. 9). This makes the attention to students with disabilities in Goals 2000: Educate America Act (P.L. 103-227) all the more significant. At the same time, however, the continuing debate as to the use of resources under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (P.L. 101-392) for students with disabilities makes clear the continuing struggle as to their inclusion.

3. Recent court cases

In the past several years, four federal district courts have issued similar decisions supporting inclusion. The cases involve an 11 year old with Down syndrome, a nine year old labelled as mentally retarded, a kindergarten student with severe behavior problems, and a student with severe mental retardation and physical disabilities.[2] (See Lipton, 1994, for a comprehensive review of these decisions.) Affirming the decision, the 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals stated, "Inclusion is a right, not a privilege of a select few." It went on to note:

---

[2] The cases are Daniel R.R. v. State Board of Education in the 5th Circuit, Greer v. Rome City School in the 11th Circuit, Oberti v. Board of Education of the Borough of Clemneton School District in the 3rd Circuit, and Sacramento City Unified Schoiol District v. Rachel Holland 9th Circuit. See Lipton (1994) for a comprehensive review of these decisions.

> We construe IDEA's mainstreaming requirement to prohibit a school from placing a child with disabilities outside of a regular classroom if educating the child in the regular classroom, with supplementary aids and support services, can be achieved satisfactorily.

On behalf of the Office of Special Education, U.S. Department of Education, the Justice Department filed an amicus brief in Holland, stating that IDEA:

> prohibits a school from placing a child with disabilities outside the regular classroom if educating the child in the regular classroom, with supplementary aids and support services, can be achieved satisfactorily.

The denial by the U.S. Supreme Court to review the circuit court's decision in Holland suggests that with circuits in agreement, these decisions are likely to stand as the law of the land. However, two 1994 district court decisions have reaffirmed that each case will be decided based upon its factual circumstances.

4. Disability rights movement

Hahn (1994), a theorist of the disability rights movement, argues for "the need to alter the educational environment rather than to pursue continuous efforts to modify the functional characteristics of disabled students" (P. 9). Echoing the language of race relations, he goes on to state, "Since separation on the basis of disability is apt to leave an enduring

imprint on the hearts and minds of disabled young people, desegregation or inclusion is a fundamental component of this process" (P. 9). Morris (1990) makes a similar point:

> People's expectations of us are informed by their previous experience of disabled people. If disabled people are segregated, are treated as alien, as different in a fundamental way, then we will never be accepted as full members of society. This is the strongest argument against special schools and against separate provision. (P. 53)

While some argue that the special education legislation (IDEA) is not a matter of civil rights (for example, Shanker, 1994), there is no question that the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a civil rights law. In a recent case, Peterson v. Hastings (Neb.) Public Schools, the court accepted the argument that the ADA supplements IDEA ("Peterson ruling", 1994). And as the ADA requirements in some areas go beyond those of IDEA, the civil rights perspective concerning inclusion gains added impetus. A further factor is that under ADA private schools are included as public accomodations, and, thus, bound by its provisions (42 U.S.C. Sec. 1218(7)(J).

5. Costs of special education

The high costs of current special education programs have been previously noted. Also, noted is that, over time, inclusive education is less expensive than a separate design. Some have charged that districts may be adopting inclusion for the sole

purpose of cutting costs. However, in light of the high costs of the current design and the evidence as to its ineffectiveness, both the lower costs and the greater benefits of inclusive education do give warrant to its adoption.

6. Parental involvement

Increasingly, many families of children with disabilities are insisting on placement for their children in general education settings, with the necessary supplementary aids and support services. Especially active are families of young children, who benefitted from IDEA's preschool programs in integrated settings. They are active in demanding that such options be made available for their children in the public schools. Furthermore, parent organizations and advocacy groups are becoming increasingly active in their support for inclusion and the training of parents in their rights.

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AND EDUCATIONAL RESTRUCTURING

Educational restructuring does not require the "fixing" of special education nor moving it closer to nor even into the "mainstream". Rather, it is a challenge to the very nature of this dual system which utilizes mainstream education for partial integration of some special education students. This cannot be achieved merely by bringing students with disabilities into the current system.

As Biklen has pointed out, "How schools see integration is crucial: Is integration understood as an outsider coming in, or

as creating a school culture so that it accepts all comers?" (Cited in Slee, 1993, p. 3). Biklen's use of the word "integration", with its connotation of race relations, is significant. It reminds that real integration can be achieved not by "allowing" persons of color into the existing white society but only as that society is transformed, a process of politics involving both the distribution of power and the culture of power.

Some have seen tension between the drive for school reform -- with its emphasis on upgrading standards -- and inclusion of all students. It is well to remember, however, that Edmonds' work in school effectiveness was driven by a concern to narrow the gap between the learning of minority and white students, a gap which he argued could be reduced by raising the floor (Edmonds, 1979).

In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights, the National Council on Disability has challenged the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) conceptualization as the basis for special education programs. The Council pointed out that LRE conceptualization derived from prisoners' rights issues and is not appropriate to the education of students with disabilities. Instead of the concept of a continuum, which at least on some occasions requires students to be separated from their age peers to receive the services they require (see Taylor, 1988), the Council favored the concept of an "array of services". Special education, the Council urged,

"needs to evolve as a support to typical education, not as a way of supplanting it. Inclusion is the most promising way to achieve this end" (NCD, 1994).

Inclusive education programs are being implemented across the nation. The National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion has recently reported on inclusion program nationally (National study of inclusive education, 1994). The study reported:

- inclusion programs are taking place in every state;
- inclusion programs are taking place in a wide range of locations -- urban, suburban, and rural school districts, large and small school districts;
- inclusion programs are occurring at all grade levels, involving students across the entire range of handicapping conditions;
- inclusion programs are being initiated by administrators, teachers, parents, university faculty, state departments of education, and as a result of court orders;
- the evaluation of inclusion programs is taking place addressing issues of implementation, outcomes, and financing.

Based upon the National Center's survey and review of the research, seven factors are necessary for inclusion to succeed. These are:

1. Visionary leadership: Illustrative of this is the statement of a Vermont special education director.

> Some years ago we came to view inclusion as a subset of the restructuring of the entire educational system. From this perspective we no longer view special education as a means to help students meet the demands of the classroom, but as a part of the classroom services that must be available to accommodate the learning needs of all children in a restructured school.

2. Collaboration: Reports from school districts indicate that the achievement of inclusive education presumes that no one teacher can -- or ought -- be expected to have all the expertise required to meet the educational needs of all the students in the classroom. Rather, individual teachers must have available to them the support systems that provide collaborative assistance and which enable them to engage in cooperative problem solving. Building planning teams, scheduling of time for teachers to work together, recognition of teachers as problem solvers, conceptualizing teachers as front-line researchers -- each of these are tools reported as necessary for collaboration.

3. Refocussed use of assessment: Traditionally, student assessments have been used as screening devices -- to determine who gets into which slot. In special education, there have been a myriad of studies as to the inadequacy of this screening. Inclusive education schools and districts report moving toward more "authentic assessment" designs,

including the use of portfolios of student's work and performances, and generally working to refocus assessment.

4. Supports for staff and students: Two factors are essential for successful inclusive education programs: systematic staff development and flexible planning time for special education and general education teachers to meet and work together. And from the vantage point of students, supports for inclusion often mean supplementary aids and support services. Districts report that these include: assignment of school aides, full- or part-time, short- or long-term; provision of needed therapy services integrated into the regular school program; peer support; "Buddy systems" or "circles of friends"; effective use of computer-aided technology and other assistive devices.

5. Funding: Current special education funding formulae often encourage separation placements. Changes in funding, so that funds follow the students, are essential to the success of inclusive education. When this occurs, inclusive education programs overall are no more costly that segregated models ("Does inclusion cost more?", 1994; McLaughlin & Warren, 1994).

6. Effective parental involvement: Inclusive schools report encouraging parental participation through family support services, as well as the development of educational programs which engage parents as co-learners with their children. Programs that bring a wide array of services to children in

the school settings report at least two sets of benefits -- the direct benefits to the children and the opportunities for parents and other family members to become involved in school-based activities.

7. Curricula adaptation and adopting of effective instructional practices: Classroom practices that have been reported as supporting inclusive education include multi-level instruction, cooperative learning, activity-based learning, mastery learning, use of instructional technology, peer support and tutoring programs.

Given the limited time period in which inclusive education programs have been implemented, there have been relatively few full-scale evaluations of outcomes (Rossman & Salzman, 1994). A number of statewide studies are underway, including in Massachusetts (Rossman & Anthony, 1992), Vermont (Hasazi, Furney, and Johnstone, 1994), Oregon (Arrick et al., ND), Michigan (Christmas, 1992), and Utah (McDonnel, McDonnel, Hardman, and McCune, 1991). Among the findings from initial studies are:

- where students came from separate classes, there was a substantial increase in time in general education classrooms (Chase & Pope, 1993);
- students with learning disabilities made academic gains as reflected in scores on criterion-referenced tests and report cards (Chase & Pope, 1993);
- students with significant disabilities had greater success in achieving IEP goals than did matched students in

traditional programs (Ferguson et al., 1992);

- benefits to students with disabilities occurred without curtailing the educational program available to nondisabled students (Co-teaching, 1991);
- gains occurred in student self-esteem (Burello & Wright, 1993), acceptance by classmates (Marwell, 1990; Christmas, 1992), and social skills (McDonnel, McDonnel, Hardman, & McCune, 1991);
- supports from parents of students with disabilities was found to be positive (Chase & Pope, 1993; Co-teaching, 1991; Marwell, 1990);
- supports from students was generally positive (Chase & Pope, 1993; Co-teaching, 1991), although not uniform (Rossman & Anthony, 1993); and
- among school staff, support ranged from very enthusiastic (Burello & Wright, 1993; Co-teaching, 1991, Rogan & Davern, 1992) to more moderate support (Rossman & Anthony, 1993; Chase & Pope, 1993; Christmas, 1992; McDonnel, McDonnel, Hardman, & McCune, 1991).

A multi-year study of the implementation of inclusion in Vermont (Vermont's Act 230, 1993), reports:

- grades for students served in general education settings were not significantly different than their grades had been when in special education classes;
- general education teachers, special educators, parents, and the students themselves judged students to have

comparable performance in the general education class settings in all of the categories measured: behavior, social interaction, classroom performance, and overall success. For example, 92% of the general education teachers, 95% of the special educators, 91% of the parents, and 94% of the students responded affirmatively to the question, "Overall, do you feel the student was successful in school?"

SPECIAL EDUCATION AND EQUITY

Equity in education is a common term used to discuss racial and language minorities, women, and the poor. Generally, it has not been used in conjunction with students with disabilities. In part, this reflects the general societal attitude toward issues of disability. It represents viewing disability in a medical model where students with impairments require special treatment. A part of that special treatment is a special and separate education system.

While there are a number of aspects to the debate about inclusion, a critical question is whether the inclusion is a civil rights matter. AFT president Al Shanker demurs. "I see no basis for the civil rights [analogy]. Black youngsters were eager to learn. That's different from a youngster who is yelling and screaming and so forth." At the heart of the segregation issue was merely the color of a child's skin, Shanker noted, which "was totally irrelevant of their education. These are two very, very different motivations" (Teachers union president,

1994, p. 174).

A leading special education litigator and Acting Executive Director, TASH (The Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps), Frank Laski challenges Shanker's viewpoint. In an article commemorating the 40th anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education, he argues the common ground people with disabilities have with African Americans and other oppressed minorities. He cites the argument made by John Davis, in response to Thurgood Marshall in Brown:

> I think if [Marshall's construction of the Fourteenth Amendment] should prevail here, there is no doubt in my mind that it would catch the Indian within its grasp as much as the Negro. If it should prevail, I am unable to see why a state would have any further right to segregate its pupils on the ground of...mental capacity. (Cited in Laski, 1994, p. 4)

Laski goes on to cite Justice Marshall, who after surveying the extensive record of social exclusion of persons with disabilities, concluded that a regime of state mandated segregation of persons with disabilities had emerged that "in its virulence and bigotry rivaled and indeed parallelled the worst excesses of Jim Crow" (Cited in Laski, 1994, p. 4).

The issues of social justice and equity encapsulated in inclusion are powerfully stated by Branson and Miller (1989).

> [I]ntegration must be...oriented toward its own destruction, aiming to destroy the very categories which are seen as

> needing to be 'integrated' into the 'normal' world. If the disabled are 'normal', so much an accepted part of our world that we take their presence, their humanity, their special qualities for granted, then there can be no 'integration' for there is no 'segregation', either conceptually, in terms of categories, taxonomies, or actually, in terms of institutional separation. (P. 161)

As it has been throughout the course of American history, the education system is both means for advancement in the society of its students and forum for debate about the nature of that society.

References

Barton, L. & Landman, M. (1993). The politics of integration: Observations on the Warnock Report. In R. Slee (Ed.), Is there a desk with my name on it? The politics of integration. (Pp. 41-49). London: The Falmer Press.

Beyond normal: Will our children learn to value diverse community members? (1993). Inclusive Education in Minnesota: What's Working?, 4-5.

Biklen, D. (1992). Schooling without labels: Parents, educators, and inclusive education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Blakeslee, S. (1994). New clue to cause of dyslexia seen in mishearing of fast sounds. New York Times (August 16), C1,10.

Branson, J. & Miller, D. (1989). Beyond policy: The deconstruction of disability. In L. Barton (Ed.), Integration: Myth or reality? (London: The Falmer Press).

Davis, S. (1994). 1994 update on inclusion of children with mental retardation. Arlington, TX: The ARC.

Educational innovation in multiracial contexts: The growth of magnet schools in American education. (1994). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational leadership, 37, 15-18, 20-24.

Ferguson, D.L., Meyer, G., Jeanchild, L., Juniper, L., & Zingo, J. (1992). Figuring out what to do with the grownups: How teachers make inclusion "work" for students with disabilities. JASH, 17 (4), 218-226.

Fifteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (1993).Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Flurry of reform in special education finance. (1993). The CSEF Resource, 1 (2), 1-3.

Gilhool, T.K. (1989). The right to an effective education: From Brown to PL 94-142 and beyond. In D.K. Lipsky & A. Gartner (Eds.), Beyond separate education: Quality education for all. (Pp. 243-253). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Granger, L. & Granger, B. (1986). The magic feather. NY: E.P.

Dutton.

Hahn, H. (1994). New trends in disability studies: Implications for educational policy. A paper prepared for the National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion invitational conference on inclusive education, Wingspread (WI) Conference Center.

Haigh, J.A. & Malever, M.C. (1993-4). Special education referral practices by gender, ethnicity, and comparison to state and district enrollments. CASE in Point, 8 (1), 13-24.

Harry, B. (1992). Cultural diversity, families, and the special education system: Communication and empowerment. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hasazi, S.B., Johnston, A.P., Liggett, A.M., & Schattman, R.A. (1994). A qualitative policy study of the Least Restrictive Environment provision of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Exceptional Children, 60 (6), 491-507.

IDEA: Fiscal policy issues and alternatives. (1994). Palo Alto, CA: Center for Special Education Finance.

Kohler, P.D. (1993). Best practices in transition: Substantiated or implied? Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 16 (2), 107-121.

Laski, F. (1994). On the 40th anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education: Footnotes for the historically impaired. TASH Newsletter, 20 (5), 3-4.

Lipton, D. (1994). The state of the law. NCERI Bulletin, 2.

McLaughlin, M.J. & Warren, S.H. (1994). Resource implications of inclusion: Impressions of special education administrators at selected sites. Palo Alto, CA Center for Special Education Finance.

Morris, J. (1990). Progress with humanity? The experience of a disabled lecturer. In R. Rieser & M. Mason (Eds.), Disability, equality in the classroom: A human rights issue. London: ILEA.

National study of inclusive education. (1994). New York: National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion, The Graduate School and University Center, The City University of New York.

NCD calls for end of special education as you know it. (1994). The Special Educator, 10 (1), 5.

Parrish, T.B. (1993a). Federal policy options for funding special education. CSEF Brief, 1, 1-4.

Parrish, T.B. (1993b). State funding provisions and Least Restrictive Environment: Implications for federal policy. CSEF Brief, 2, 1-4.

Persons with disabilities lag behind other Americans in Employment, education, and income. (1994). Washington, D.C.: National Organization on Disability.

Peterson ruling raises troubling questions on ADA, The Special Educator, 10 (4), 49, 59-60.

Podell, D.M. & Soodak, L.C. (1993). Teacher efficacy and bias in special education referrals. Journal of Educational Research, 86 (4), 247-253.

Rossman, G.B. & Anthony, P.G. (1992) Restructuring from within: The Massachusetts experiment with integrating all students in the classroom, unpub. mss.

Rossman, G.B. & Salzman, J. (1994). Evaluating inclusive education programs: A survey of current practice. A paper prepared for the National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion invitational conference on inclusive education, Wingspread (WI) Conference Center.

Separate and unequal. (1993). U.S. News & World Report (December 13), 46-60.

Serving the Nation's students with disabilities: Progress and prospects. A report to the President and the Congress of the United States. (1993). Washington, D.C.: National Council on Disability.

Shanker, A. (1994). Inclusion and ideology. New York Times (February 6),

Sixteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (1994). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Skrtic, T.M. (1991). The special education paradox: Equity as the way to excellence. Harvard Educational Review, 61 (2), 148-207.

Slee, R. (1993). Introduction. In R. Slee (Ed.), Is there a desk with my name on it? The politics of integration. (Pp. 1-). London: The Falmer Press.

Slee, R. (1993) (Ed.) Is there a desk with my name on it? The politics of integration. London: The Falmer Press.

Soodak, L.C. & Podell, D.M. (1993). Teacher efficacy and student problem as factors in special education referral. The Journal of Special Education, 27(1), 66-81.

Taylor, S. (1988). Caught in the continuum: A critical analysis of the principle of least restrictive environment. Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 13 (1), 41-53.

Teachers union president calls inclusion "fad". The Special Educator, 9 (12), 173-174.

Vermont's ACT 230: Three years later, A report on the impact of Act 230. (1993). Montpelier: Vermont Department of Education.

Verstegen, D. A. (1994). Fiscal provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: Historical overview. Palo Alto, CA: Center for Special Education Finance.

Wagner, M. (1992). Being female -- A secondary disability? Gender differences in the transition experiences of young people with disabilities. A paper presented at the American Educational Research annual meeting, San Francisco, April, 1992.

Walker, L. (1987). Procedural rights in the wrong system: Special education is not enough. In A. Gartner & T. Joe (Eds.), Images of the disabled, disabling images. (Pp. 97-116). New York: Praeger.

Weinstein, D.F. (1993-4). Special education referral and classification practices by gender, family status and terms used: A case study. CASE in Point, 8 (1), 25-36.

Williams, W., Fox, T.J., Thousand, J., & Fox, W. (1990). Level of acceptance and implementation of best practices in the education of students with severe handicaps in Vermont. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 120-131.